



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

therefore admits of no rivalry either with graven images or that which they symbolize. If Amos therefore moved only in the simple circle of country life, he did it to purpose, and made most effective use of all natural phenomena, common or uncommon, small or great.

In conclusion, Dr. Pusey justly suggests the wondrous rigor of the sudden summons (iv., 12): "Because I will do *this* unto thee [the silence as to what *this* is, is more thrilling than words], prepare to meet thy God, O Israel!" Or the extreme pathos with which the picture of the luxurious rich is closed (vi., 6) when having said how they heaped luxuries one upon another, he ends with what they did *not* do: "they are not grieved for the afflictions of Joseph."

## THE BATTLE ADDRESS OF ABIJAH.

2 Chronicles XIII., 4—12.

BY REV. JAMES L. BIGGER, M. A., B. D.,  
Lisburn, Ireland.

Is this speech of Abijah an historical fiction? Are the references to Levitical ordinances as gross anachronisms as Shakspere's "shipman's card" or "cannon" in the time of Macbeth? Is it as impossible that the Jewish king could have spoken as is represented, as it is that the words of the play could have been uttered in the days of the Scottish monarch?

These questions are suggested by the following note in Dr. Robertson Smith's "Old Testament in the Jewish Church," p. 421. "The speeches in Chronicles are not literal reports. They are freely composed without strict reference to the exact historical situation" . . . . "Thus in Abijah's speech on the field of battle (2 Chron. XIII., 4 sq.) the king is made to say that Jeroboam's rebellion took place when Rehoboam was a mere lad and tender-hearted, and had not courage to withstand the rebels. The mere lad (**נִעְמָן**) according to 1 Kings XIV., 21 was forty-one years old. Abijah then proceeds to boast of the regular temple service conducted according to Levitical law. But the service described is that of the Second Temple, for the king speaks of the golden candlestick as one of its elements. In Solomon's Temple there stood not one golden candlestick in the holy place in front of the *adyton* (**דֵבֶר**, oracle, i. e., Holy of Holies) but ten (1 Kings VII., 49). Again the morning and evening burnt-offerings are mentioned. But there is a great concurrence of evidence that the evening offering was purely cereal in the First Temple, or indeed in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (1 Kings XVIII., 36, *Hebrew*; 2 Kings XVI., 15; Ezra IX., 4, *Hebrew*). Compare Kuenen's *Religion of Israel*, chap. 14, note 1. This speech is one of the clearest proofs that the Chronicler's descriptions of ordinances are taken from the usages of his own time."

Three arguments are here expressed or implied: 1. The word **נִעְמָן** signifies "a mere lad," and could not under any circumstances be applied to a man forty-one years of age. 2. The golden candlestick, as distinguished from ten golden candlesticks, was not an element of the Temple till the Second Temple was built. 3. No

stated burnt-offering (**תְּלִין**) was presented evening by evening in the time of the First Temple, nor indeed in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, but only a meat-offering (**מַנְחָה**), which is to be interpreted as an exclusively cereal offering. The conclusion to be drawn is that there is here "one of the clearest proofs" that the Chronicler ascribes to earlier ages the usages and ordinances of his own time. An examination of these arguments cannot be uninteresting or unprofitable.

1. The exact signification of the word **נֶעֶר** and its limitations can be ascertained only by an accurate examination of the passages where it is employed. It is applied to Moses when an infant of three months<sup>1</sup>, to the weaned child Samuel<sup>2</sup>, to a boy of about fifteen<sup>3</sup>, to Joseph, when he was seventeen years of age<sup>4</sup>, and to a young man of marriageable age<sup>5</sup>. If the usage of the word were confined to such instances, it might be interpreted, "a mere lad." But Benjamin is repeatedly called a **נֶעֶר**<sup>6</sup>, when Joseph was thirty-nine years of age, and twenty-two years in Egypt, consequently when Benjamin was at least twenty-three, Professor Delitzsch<sup>7</sup> says, "at least twenty-four." Eli's sons are spoken of under this name in 1 Sam. ii., 17. Assuming the Levitical legislation to have been in force, they cannot have been less than twenty-five years old at the time<sup>8</sup>. It is difficult in any case, in the light of the history, to believe that they had not reached this age. Certainly they were not "mere lads." Solomon, again, not only is called a **נֶעֶר** by his father in the Book of Chronicles<sup>9</sup>, where Wellhausen and his followers would say it was untrustworthy, but also, as is recorded in the Book of Kings, calls himself by the name, and even adds to it the epithet "little."<sup>10</sup> At this time Solomon had been married to the mother of Rehoboam at least two years<sup>11</sup>. Equally evident is it that the word in dispute is applied to another son of David, long after he had passed the age of boyhood. Absalom had his own house and was assuredly not "a mere lad," when Tamar confided to him the story of her wrong. He waited afterwards "two full years"<sup>12</sup> before he avenged his sister at his sheepshearing. While the "young men" (**נֶעֶרִים**), the king's sons, fled, Absalom betook himself to Geshur "and was there three years."<sup>13</sup> On his return he dwelt "two full years"<sup>14</sup> in Jerusalem. Then after maturing his rebellion for "four years,"<sup>15</sup> if the reading of the Syriac and Vulgate be adopted, he was at last slain in the battle of the wood of Ephraim. Thus eleven full years elapsed between Ammon's sin and Absalom's death. It is impossible to conceive of Absalom, the father of four children<sup>16</sup>, as less than thirty years of age at the time of his death. Yet he is called at that time "a young man" (**נֶעֶר**)<sup>17</sup>. Some indeed are of opinion, on the ground of the existing text of 2 Sam. xv., 7, that he lived forty years. Others understand the number "forty" to refer to the years of David's reign, in which case Absalom would have been at his decease between thirty-three and forty years of age.<sup>18</sup> The application of the term **נֶעֶר** to Joshua<sup>19</sup> will be a last example. There is a fairly general concurrence of opinion that Joshua ruled, after the death of Moses, twenty-five or twenty-seven years. Josephus<sup>20</sup> witnesses to the former number, and Ewald and Fuerst are prepared to accept it. Clemens of Alexandria<sup>21</sup> supports the latter. Africanus in his

<sup>1</sup> Ex. ii., 6. <sup>2</sup> 1 Sam. i., 24. <sup>3</sup> Gen. xxi., 17 ff. <sup>4</sup> Gen. xxxvii., 2. <sup>5</sup> Gen. xxxiv., 19. <sup>6</sup> Gen. xliv., 30 ff. <sup>7</sup> On Gen. xxxv., 16-20. <sup>8</sup> Cf. Num. viii., 24 and iv., 3. <sup>9</sup> 1 Chron. xxix., 1. <sup>10</sup> 1 Kgs. iii., 7. <sup>11</sup> Cf. 1 Kgs. xi., 42 and xiv., 21. <sup>12</sup> 2 Sam. xiii., 23. <sup>13</sup> Verse 38. <sup>14</sup> 2 Sam. xiv., 28. <sup>15</sup> 2 Sam. xv., 7. <sup>16</sup> 2 Sam. xiv., 27. <sup>17</sup> 2 Sam. xviii., 5, 32. <sup>18</sup> Cf. 2 Sam. iii., 3 and 1 Kgs. ii., 11. <sup>19</sup> Ex. xxxiii., 11. <sup>20</sup> Ant. V. i., 29. <sup>21</sup> Strom. I., p. 384. Ed. Potter.

Chronica gives both numbers<sup>22</sup>. Joshua “died being one hundred years old.”<sup>23</sup> It follows that at the beginning of the forty years wandering in the wilderness he was forty-three or forty-five years of age. And the fact that Caleb was thirty-eight years old at the Exodus<sup>24</sup> gives a general corroboration to these figures. To complete the argument, it is only necessary to remind the reader that, after the Exodus, this Joshua is called a **נָעַם**<sup>25</sup>.

Where, now, is there room for the critic's cavil against the words of Abijah? If Solomon, the king of Israel, if Absalom, the almost successful rebel, if Joshua, the victorious general against the Amalekites, could each of them be called a **נָעַם** why might not Abijah, whose interest it was to make as little as possible of his father's defeat, designate by the same name the rash and puerile Rehoboam, who was, as a matter of fact, “tender-hearted and had not courage to withstand the rebels”?

2. The book of Kings gives the historical fact that Solomon had made ten candlesticks of gold.<sup>26</sup> Abijah, it is assumed, comes into collision with this when he speaks of “the candlestick of gold.” Now the contradiction, if there be a contradiction, is equally against the statements of the Chronicler himself. In two passages, 1 Chronicles xxviii., 15, and 2 Chronicles iv., 7, he narrates how “candlesticks” were made for the Temple. It must, therefore, be supposed that two inconsistent methods were adopted by the writer. In one passage he describes the service of the Second Temple, and speaks of a single candlestick; in other passages he accepts the true account given in Kings and mentions candlesticks.

The fallacy of this reasoning may be seen best from a parallel example. The Chronicler records that Abijah boasts in this same speech<sup>27</sup> of the shewbread table, not of tables. This harmonizes with his subsequent allusion to a single shewbread table in the time of Hezekiah<sup>28</sup>. It agrees, too, with the account given of Solomon's work in the book of Kings. “He made the table of gold whereupon the shewbread was.”<sup>29</sup> It is perfectly certain that one table was assigned to the shewbread in the time of Solomon. But the same Chronicler narrates, in these different passages, that there were “tables” for the shewbread in Solomon's Temple.<sup>30</sup> How is it to be accounted for, that he who is charged with adapting his narrative to the ordinances of the Second Temple, here departs from these ordinances in so marked a manner? It cannot be said that the record of tables is untrue. For if it be not true, whence did the Chronicler assume the fact? Not from the usage of the Second Temple for it is not its usage. Not from the book of Kings, for that book mentions only a single table. He must have written of several tables because, in truth, Solomon had made ten.

Now, if Abijah could speak correctly of the table of shewbread, though Solomon had made ten, might he not perhaps speak with equal right of one candlestick, though there were ten in the temple of Solomon? Must there not have been some reason for the special designation of one table and of one candlestick of the ten, as the table and the candlestick? What is that reason? The critic who has relegated the Levitical legislation to post-exilic times cannot reply. But he who still holds the traditional view of its Mosaic origin is at no loss for an answer. With unerring finger he can point to the twenty-fourth chapter of Leviticus.

---

<sup>22</sup> See Routh, Rel. Sac. Vol. II. pp. 274, 283, 431-2. <sup>23</sup> Josh. xxiv., 29. <sup>24</sup> Cf. Josh. xiv., 10. <sup>25</sup> Ex. xxxii., 11. <sup>26</sup> 1 Kgs. vii., 49. <sup>27</sup> 2 Chron. xiii., 11. <sup>28</sup> 2 Chron. xxix., 18. <sup>29</sup> 1 Kgs. vii., 48. <sup>30</sup> See 1 Chron. xxviii., 16; 2 Chron. iv. 8, 19.

There one candlestick was appointed, which through all time, even though ten were made, would still hold its pre-eminence. There, and there positively alone in the Bible, could Abijah have heard of a "pure table."<sup>31</sup> Refuse to accept the pre-existence of the Mosaic legislation, and it is impossible to account for the manufacture by Solomon of "a table" as is related in Kings, and yet of "tables" as Chronicles describes. Assume the pre-existence, and it is equally easy to see how one table could be singled out for special prominence, and to believe that Abijah might speak of "the candlestick of the ten."

3. The priests of Baal prophesied after noon till "the offering up of the offering" ( *מנחה*).<sup>32</sup> "At the time of the offering up of the offering" ( *מנחה*),<sup>33</sup> Elijah stepped forward and vindicated his God. King Ahaz commanded Urijah to offer upon the great altar "the evening offering" ( *מנחה*).<sup>34</sup> Ezra in his humiliation rose "at the evening offering" ( *מנחה*).<sup>35</sup> It is indubitable that a stated offering ( *מנחה*) was presented in the evening. Professor Smith asserts that there was no other stated evening sacrifice, especially no burnt-offering ( *עלה*). It is, he maintains, altogether inaccurate to ascribe to Abijah his boast of "burnt-offerings," evening by evening. The argument is not directed against the morning burnt-offering, but it holds equally well, or equally ill, if so applied. Add 2 Kings iii., 20 to the verses cited above, and this becomes evident. There it is said that water came from the way of Edom "in the morning at the time of the offering up of the offering" ( *מנחה*). It is an exact parallel to the passage 1 Kgs. xviii., 36. If from the latter it is argued that the evening sacrifice was only a meat-offering ( *מנחה*), from the former the same must be argued of the morning sacrifice. It is impossible to escape this conclusion. If the reasoning be good in one instance, it is good in the other, and if bad, bad. Now it is evident from the charge of Ahaz to Urijah,<sup>36</sup> already referred to, that it is thoroughly bad in reference to the morning offering. The king commanded the priest to burn on the great altar, the "morning burnt-offering" ( *עלה*). There is a morning burnt-offering as well as a morning meat-offering. Here are passages, taken be it observed, from the Second Book of Kings, not from the so-called anachronous record of the Chronicler, in which these two are mentioned. It would be uncritical to ignore the sixteenth chapter, and to argue from the third chapter that a "meat-offering" alone was presented in the morning. The meat-offering ( *מנחה*) and the burnt-offering ( *עלה*) were at that hour offered side by side. May this not have been the case in the evening? If the argument here advanced against the morning burnt-offering, does not prove its non-existence, why should a train of reasoning, similar in every particular, prove the non-existence of the evening burnt-offering. Is it an impossible supposition that the evening meat-offering ( *מנחה*) and the evening burnt-offering ( *עלה*) were both offered to Jehovah? It is not, however, a mere supposition. In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the critic confidently declares, no stated burnt-offering had been introduced. And yet in the time of Zerubbabel, seventy-eight years before Ezra reached Palestine, ninety-one years before the arrival of Nehemiah they offered, it is distinctly affirmed,<sup>37</sup> burnt-offerings morning and evening. Professor Smith says there was no evening burnt-offering

<sup>31</sup> The peculiar phrase, *הטהר השלוח*, occurs only in Lev. xxiv., 6 and 2 Chron. xiii., 11. <sup>32</sup> 1 Kgs. xvii., 29. <sup>33</sup> Verse 36. <sup>34</sup> 2 Kgs. xvi., 15. <sup>35</sup> Ezra ix., 4, 5. <sup>36</sup> 2 Kgs. xvi., 15. <sup>37</sup> Ezra iii., 3.

(עֲלֵה); the record tells clearly that there was. A more deliberate contradiction cannot be imagined. It is manifest that the evening meat-offering (**מַנְחָה**) and the evening burnt-offering (**עַלְלה**) existed together.

The book of Kings assigns a morning burnt-offering (**עַלְלה**) and a morning meat-offering (**מַנְחָה**) to the regal period in exactest agreement with the requirements of the law.<sup>38</sup> In Ezra the same two offerings in the evening are equally in accord with Mosaic legislation.<sup>39</sup> Do not these facts meet and confute Professor Smith and the school of critics to which he belongs? They feel themselves compelled to date the Levitical ordinances in post-exilic times, because the history ignores or contradicts them. Are they not now bound, on the same principles, to accept an early date for the authorship of those portions of the Priest's Book which treats of the sacrifices in question? They, at least, are part of the ritual with which the historian is familiar.

Accept the earlier composition of these parts of the Pentateuch, and it becomes easy to explain the allusions. In the Law the continual burnt-offering and the continual meat-offering are alike emphasized.<sup>40</sup> Is it not perfectly natural that the whole stated service is called now by one emphatic part of it, now by the other? One speaks of it as the meat-offering (**מַנְחָה**), all the more readily since this word had not altogether lost its early signification of an offering in general.<sup>41</sup> It was not confined, (though Professor Smith implies that it was), exclusively to cereal offerings, but was also applied to offerings of flesh.<sup>42</sup> Another characterizes, as Abijah does, the whole by the most important part of it, and speaks of the burnt-offering (**עַלְלה**). In this there is the most perfect harmony if the Levitical legislation be assumed to exist. If its existence be denied, there is, no doubt confusion thrice confounded.

Professor Smith must assuredly be a Scotchman of a peculiar type. Painstaking investigation and excessive caution are proverbially associated with Scotland. In him they are conspicuous only by their absence. He is rash in the extreme and most positive when he is most illogical. To him the statement that Solomon offered burnt-offerings<sup>43</sup> "can hardly bear any other sense than that the king officiated at the altar *in person!*"<sup>44</sup> When it is said that the people had not dwelt in booths at the feast of tabernacles "since the days of Joshua the son of Nun,"<sup>45</sup> he interprets it to mean, in spite of Ezra III., 4, that "the feast of tabernacles had never been observed according to the Law, from the time that the Israelites occupied Canaan under Joshua,—that is of course never at all!"<sup>46</sup> He asserts that the prophecy of Jeremiah concerning the pillars, and sea, and vases<sup>47</sup> is "not only false but palpably absurd," because forsooth they "could not have been transported *entire!*"<sup>48</sup> Where is it said that they would remain unbroken? Of reckless assertion and hasty generalization the note on Abijah's battle address is not the least notable example.

<sup>38</sup> Ex. xxix., 39, 40; Num. xxviii., 45. <sup>39</sup> Ex. xxix., 39, 41; Num. xxviii., 4, 8. <sup>40</sup> Num. iv., 16; Ex. xxix., 42; Num. xxix., 11. <sup>41</sup> Abel's sacrifice of a lamb is called a **עַלְלה**, Gen. iv., 4. <sup>42</sup> See 1 Sam. ii., 17. <sup>43</sup> 1 Kgs. ix., 25. <sup>44</sup> "O. T. in the Jewish Church," p. 248. Cf. Professor Green's "Moses and the Prophets," p. 106. <sup>45</sup> Neh. viii., 17. <sup>46</sup> Page 56. <sup>47</sup> Jer. xxvii., 19-22. <sup>48</sup> Page 116.